

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

REC'D 09 JUN 2004

WIPO

PCT

From the:
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To:

Griffith Hack
GPO Box 1285K
MELBOURNE VIC 3001

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) **01 JUN 2004**

Applicant's or agent's file reference
FP19682

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/AU2004/000517

International filing date (day/month/year)
21 April 2004

Priority date (day/month/year)
22 April 2003

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
Int. Cl. ⁷ **A21B 3/13; B65D 5/30, 5/24, 5/40, 81/34**

Applicant

AMCOR LIMITED et al

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. I | Basis of the opinion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. II | Priority |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. III | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. IV | Lack of unity of invention |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. V | Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VI | Certain documents cited |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VII | Certain defects in the international application |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VIII | Certain observations on the international application |

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/AU
AUSTRALIAN PATENT OFFICE
PO BOX 200, WODEN ACT 2606, AUSTRALIA
E-mail address: pct@ipaaustralia.gov.au
Facsimile No. (02) 6285 3929

Authorized Officer

JEFFREY CARL

Telephone No. (02) 6283 2543

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/AU2004/000517

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/AU2004/000517

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims 2, 7, 8, 11-13, 15, 16	YES
	Claims 1, 3-6, 9, 10, 14	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims 2	YES
	Claims 1, 3-16	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims 1-16	YES
	Claims	NO

2. Citations and explanations:

The following documents identified in the International Search Report have been considered for the purposes of this opinion:

(i) US 4573633	(v) US 2944719
(ii) WO 2000/053505	(vi) US 4114797
(iii) US 4371110	(vii) US 4208007
(iv) US 4260098	(viii) WO 1998/017539

Novelty (N) Claims 1, 3-6, 9, 10, 14

Claims 1, 9, 14: All of the features defined in each of these claims are explicitly disclosed in citation (i). With respect to claim 1 for example, Figures 1 and 4-7 of this citation disclose a paperboard baking and shipping tray having a rectangular base with square walls and corners and also including locking panels that retain the end walls and side walls in upright positions.

Claims 3-6, 10: The minor features added by each of these claims are also explicitly disclosed in citation (i).

Inventive Step (IS) Claims 1, 3-16

Claims 1, 3-6, 9, 10, 14: see above.

Claims 7, 8, 11: The gusseted corners added by these claims are explicitly disclosed in each of citations (ii)-(vii). Therefore, these claims are anticipated by the obvious combination of the disclosure of citation (i) with the disclosure of any one of citations (ii)-(vii).

Claims 12, 13: The methods defined in these claims are explicitly disclosed in each of citations (vi) and (vii). Therefore, these claims are anticipated by the obvious combination of the disclosure of citation (i) with the disclosure of one of citations (vi) or (vii).

Claims 15, 16: The methods defined in these claims are explicitly disclosed in citation (iii). Therefore, these claims are anticipated by the obvious combination of the disclosure of citation (i) with the disclosure of citation (iii).

Claims 1, 3-16: Notwithstanding the above comments, the inventions defined in each of these claims are considered obvious when the disclosure of either one of citations (vi) or (vii) is combined with the disclosure from any one of citations (ii)-(v).